

Appl No. 10/533,691  
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007  
Amendment dated: December 17, 2007

### REMARKS

Applicants have modified Figure 22 in accordance with the Examiner's request to incorporate the "Prior Art" reference requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention.

More specifically, Applicants' presently claimed invention is directed to an ink jet printing system wherein the energy delivered to one of the ink jet elements is delivered with a delay of up to 20% of the supply time of energy for the reference with respect to the supply timing so as to desirably alter the discharge angle of the droplet discharge from the nozzle of the ink jet printing device. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references cited by the Examiner provide no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding this advance in the art.

Applicants note that even the Examiner has recognized the deficiencies of the prior art cited in the most recent office action. The Examiner indeed has even acknowledged that there is no teaching or suggestion the primary or secondary references concerning the specifically claimed preferable maximum difference in ejection timings in order to achieve the advantages of the present invention. The Examiner attempts to overcome these recognized and acknowledged deficiencies by asserting that they are mere obvious variations of the prior art. Significantly, however, the Examiner has failed to identify any specific teaching or suggestion in

Appl. No. 10/533,691  
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007  
Amendment dated: December 17, 2007

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS:**

Fig. 22 has been amended to include the legend "Prior Art", as requested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Appl. No. 10/533,691  
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007  
Amendment dated: December 17, 2007

support of the Examiner's conclusion other than the ultimate conclusion that the 20% range is a mere obvious variation of prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's unsupported assertions are an inadequate basis for the Examiner's rejections of the claims in the instant application based on the art of record. The Examiner is required to identify with some specificity genuine support for the rejections set forth by the Examiner in the most recent office action. The bald allegations relied upon by the Examiner in this office action are not adequate and do not provide an appropriate basis for the rejection of the claims in the instant application.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance as the Examiner has failed to provide the appropriate basis for rejecting the claims in the instant application. More specifically, the Examiner has failed to demonstrate where the prior art indicates or suggests that the claimed timing differentiation is obvious.

Applicants therefore request reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner in the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/17/07

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke  
**ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS, LLC**  
Sears Tower, Suite 5450  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6306  
Tel: (312) 277-2006  
**Attorneys for Applicant**